

REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16-22, and 24-31 were previously pending in the application. All the pending claims stand rejected. Claims 1, 9, 19, and 27 are amended.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-8 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0066481 to Hong et al. (“Hong”) in view of JP Publication No. 10-098190 to Kubota (“Kubota”).

Claim 1 is patentable over Hong and Kubota because it recites that “the shielding electrode provides a common voltage shielding for the region on which it is disposed....” As described in paragraph [0115] of the Application (see U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0051943), the shielding electrodes 196 and 196a block the effect of the common voltage Vcom applied to the common electrode 270 on the channels of the TFTs. In contrast, Hong’s second common electrode 224, which allegedly corresponds to the “shielding electrode” of Claim 1 according to the Office Action, shields the pixel electrode from the effects of the data voltage (see Hong, paragraph [0051]). Hence, there is no element in Hong’s apparatus that corresponds to the “shielding electrode” and provides a common voltage shielding. Hong’s first common electrode 206 is connected to the second common electrode 224 through a contact hole 224a (see Hong, paragraph [0051]) and thus also provides no shielding from common voltage. Hence, Hong fails to disclose any element that corresponds to the “shielding electrode.”

Likewise, Kubota fails to disclose a “shielding electrode” that provides a common voltage shielding for a region. Kubota’s light-shading film 3 is some type of opaque, non-

light-transmitting material that blocks light. In contrast to Kubota, Claim 1 recites, “the shielding electrode comprises a transparent electrode.” For example, the transparent electrode transmits light, since it may include a light-transmitting material such as ITO or IZO. The Office Action fails to point out whether any section in Kubota states that light-shading film 3 shields a region from a common voltage.

Claims 2-8 depend from Claim 1 and are thus patentable over Hong and Kubota for the same reason as Claim 1.

Claim 26 is patentable over Hong and Kubota because it recites that “the first shielding electrode provides a common voltage shielding for the region on which it is disposed.” The explanation provided above for patentability of Claim 1 applies here.

Claims 9-14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0159016 to Nishida (“Nishida”) and Kubota.

Claim 9 is patentable over the cited references because it recites that “the shielding electrode provides a common voltage shielding for the region on which it is disposed.” As explained above, Hong and Kubota fails to disclose any element that corresponds to the “shielding electrode.” Nishida fails to cure this deficiency. Although the Office Action points to Nishida’s element 26 as the “first shielding electrode” (see Office Action, page 5), element 26 is, in fact, a common electrode (see, e.g., Nishida’s paragraph [0057]). As Nishida’s common electrode 26 does not provide a common voltage shielding for any region, Nishida fails to disclose any element that corresponds to the “shielding electrode” recited in Claim 9.

Claims 10-14 and 18 depend from Claim 9 and are thus patentable over Hong, Nishida, and Kubota for the same reason as Claim 9.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong in view of Nishida and Kubota, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,091,467 to Kubo (“Kubo”).

Claims 16 and 17 depend from Claim 9. As explained above, Claim 9 is patentable over Hong, Nishida, and Kubota because none of the cited references discloses a “shielding electrode.” Kubo, like the other references, also fails to disclose a “shielding electrode” that provides a common voltage shielding for a region. Hence, Claims 16 and 17 are patentable over Hong, Nishida, Kubota, and Kubo.

Claims 19-22, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota in view of Kubo. Claim 19 recites that “the shielding electrode provides a common voltage shielding for the region on which it is disposed.” As explained above, neither Kubota nor Kubo discloses any element that would correspond to the “shielding electrode.” Hence, Claim 19 and Claims 20-22, 24, and 25 that depend from Claim 19 are patentable over Kubota and Kubo.

Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota in view of Nishida. Claim 27 is patentable over Kubota and Nishida because it recites that “the first shielding electrode provides a common voltage shielding for the region on which it is disposed.” As explained above, neither Kubota nor Nishida disclose

this limitation. Claims 28-31 depend from Claim 27 and are thus patentable over Kubota and Nishida for the same reason as Claim 27.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance. Authorization is given to charge any fees due or credit any overpayments in regard to this communication to deposit account 50-5029. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at (408) 331-1672 is welcomed and encouraged.

Certification of Electronic Transmission

Certificate of Transmission: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's EFS-Web electronic system on:

March 2, 2010

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Kieun "Jenny" Sung

/Kieun "Jenny" Sung/

Respectfully submitted,

/Kieun "Jenny" Sung/

Kieun "Jenny" Sung
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,639

Innovation Counsel LLP

21771 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 200
Cupertino, California 95014
Direct: (408) 331-1672
Telephone: (408) 331-1670
Facsimile: (408) 725-8263
E-mail: jsung@innovationcounsel.com